



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,829	06/28/2001	Raja Krishnaswamy	MS174293.1	5228
27195	7590	10/10/2008	EXAMINER	
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP			CHANKONG, DOHM	
127 Public Square			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
57th Floor, Key Tower			2452	
CLEVELAND, OH 44114				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/10/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/893,829	KRISHNASWAMY ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		DOHM CHANKONG	2152
<i>--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.			
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>			
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>			
NOTICE OF APPEAL			
<p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>			
AMENDMENTS			
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>			
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>			
<p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): <u>The \$101 rejection of claim 27 is withdrawn.</u></p>			
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>			
<p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8, 10-15, 17-23 and 27.</u></p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</p>			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>			
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>			
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:</p> <p><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p>			
<p>12. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Note the attached <i>Information Disclosure Statement(s)</i>. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s), <u>8/8/2008</u></p>			
<p>13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>The proposed amendment is entered to overcome the \$101 rejection of claim 27. No other claims are amended.</u> <u>Therefore, claims 1-8, 10-15, 17-23, and 27 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the final rejection filed on 7/31/2008.</u></p>			
<p style="text-align: center;">/Dohm Chankong/ Examiner, Art Unit 2152</p>			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's argue that the cited prior art references fail to teach a proxy that performs proxy pre-processing comprising transaction processing and machine learning to determine an amount of data sent to the object, determine a type of data sent to the object and/or determine which objects are invoked before invoking a method on the object. The final rejection relied on Hollander to teach the foregoing feature. In Applicant's view, Hollander "teaches identification of the type and value of the arguments passed by the calling applications to determine if the API function is allowed to execute." It is unclear from Applicant's arguments why Hollander's determination of "the type and value of the arguments passed" by a calling application to an object is different from Applicant's claimed "determining a type of data sent to the object." The rejection equates Hollander's recited "arguments" with Applicant's claimed "data."

Applicant argues that the claims are distinguished because they recite "optimization that includes determining an OPTIMAL type or value of the arguments and passing the OPTIMAL type/value" (emphasis added). This is not what is claimed. The claims merely teach determining a type of the argument that is being passed. Applicant additionally argues that "the invocation includes optimization of the amount of data sent to the remote object." The claims merely recite "determining an amount of data sent to the object." Applicant's arguments are not consistent with the language of the claims. Because Hollander discloses determining a type of data being sent to an object as part of a interception pre-processing function, Hollander teaches the limitation as they are currently written. Based on the foregoing, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the rejection set forth in the previous action is maintained.